IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE DR JUSTICE G.YETHIRAJULU

WRIT PETITION NO : 19313 of 2004

Between:

M.Gangadhar,

S/o M.Masthan,
R/o Ganugu Chintalapalli Village Post,

Putloor Mandal,

Ananthapur District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The A.P.State Road Transport Corporation,

rep., by its Chairman and Managing Director,
Musheerabad,

Hyderabad
2 The A.P.State Road Transport Corporation,

rep., by its Regional Manager,
Ananthapur Region,

Ananthapur,

Ananthapur District

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue an order or direction or Writ particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of the respondents instead of regularizing the services of the

petitioner as regular Conductor, the 2nd respondent has dis-engaged the petitioner orally as Casual Conductor with effect from 25-08-2004 to 08-09-2004 in place of regular Conductors in connection with special operations for Krishna Pushkarams in Vijayawada Region is wholly illegal, arbitrary, unjust and contrary to law and also violative of Articles 14,16 and 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner by reinstating the petitioner into service as Conductor Gr-II with continuity of service and with full Back wages.

Counsel for the Petitioner: Ms. B.MALLESWARI

Counsel for the Respondents: Mr. P.VINAYAKA SWAMY (SC FOR APSRTC)

The Court at the stage of admission made the following:

The petitioner contends that he was selected as a Grade II Conductor by the 2nd respondent-Corporation in the year, 2000. He was engaged as a temporary Conductor on various occasions and he was disengaged on 8-9-2004. The petitioner contends that the respondent-Corporation is re-engaging some Conductors in Ananthapur Region. Therefore, he approached this Court seeking a direction to the 2nd respondent to consider his case for re-engagement as a casual Conductor.

In the light of the representation made by the petitioner, the 2nd respondent is directed to consider the case of the petitioner for re-engagement, if his juniors are engaged for the said purpose, subject to the availability of work.

The Writ Petition is accordingly disposed of.

_____

(Dr. G.YETHIRAJULU,J)

14th October, 2004.

Tsy/cs

To

1 The Chairman and Managing Director,

A.P.State Road Transport Corporation,

Musheerabad,

Hyderabad.

2 The Regional Manager,

A.P.State Road Transport Corporation,

Ananthapur Region,

Ananthapur,

Ananthapur District.

3 Two CD Copies.